

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(b) as being anticipated by Bujaryn US patent 5,542,74. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujaryn in view of Onishi US patent 6,776,452. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujaryn in view of Callegari US patent 6,269,578. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujaryn in view of Raftery US patent 4,700,430. Claims 10-12 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujaryn in view of Chapman et al. US patent 2,747,654. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujaryn in view of Chapman et al., and further in view of Childress US patent 2,296,705 and Loescher US patent 5,749,121.

Claim 20 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, with an indication that the claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this response, claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 19 and 20. In view of the Examiner's indication, it is thus believed that claim 12 is an allowable form. Claims 15-18 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, and are thus also believed allowable.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place the application into condition for allowance with claims 12 and 15-18, and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Andrew S. McConnell
Reg. No. 32,272

Boyle Fredrickson, S.C.
840 North Plankinton Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53203
(414) 225-9755
Customer No.: 23598